



Ottar Gadeholt

[@OGadeholt](#)

Jan 7 • 9 tweets • 2 min read • [Read on X](#)

Subscribe

Bookmark Save as PDF

Reading Iunker's response to @OleAsbjoernNess' accusation of double standards and anti-Semitism.

I sympathize with Iunker, but I don't see that the article presents any real arguments.

Instead, he refers to an article in Klassekampen, and to a slanderous article by de Waal.

Iunker cites paragraph c of the Genocide Convention: "deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part", but when one looks at the images from Gaza before 7.10.23, it is not obvious that these living conditions were unbearable.

Rather, the fact is that living conditions in Gaza were not that bad at all. There was enough food, nice beaches, nice hotels, and an infrastructure that seemed to withstand comparison with, for example, Tunisia or Libya. Gaza could have become a tourist destination, and apparently was to some extent.

Of course, one could object that the citizens were not free to travel wherever they wanted.

But honestly, if the government of a country is planning to destroy its neighbor, it is not difficult to understand that the latter would refuse entry and try to prevent weapons from entering.

It's almost like accusing South Korea of genocide against North Korea, because the citizens are not free, and because there is constant famine there. The South Koreans have every right to defend themselves, both against open and covert acts of war. And they do.

But what about what's happening now? Gaza is in ruins, so does that have to be genocide?

No. Hamas still hasn't surrendered, and the population hasn't done anything (or at least not enough) to get the hostages released and to get Hamas to end the war.

Accusing Israel of continuing a war they have militarily won, when the perpetrators of Hamas are still in power, is like criticizing the Allies for continuing the war against Nazi Germany after Kursk and Stalingrad and Normandy.

As long as Hitler was in power, any ceasefire would give the Nazis time and breathing space to rebuild and start a new war in the East or West. Churchill and Roosevelt understood this. Until Hamas is defeated, the war is not won. Even if the civilian casualties are terrible.

If I had to choose between OAN and FI as a thinker, or as a conversation partner over a glass of wine or five, I would choose FI ten times out of ten. But here he disappoints. He presents a conclusion without showing the arguments, and does not try to see what Ness really means.

It is disappointing.

...

Missing some Tweet in this thread? You can try to [force a refresh](#)

Mail Share